

BACONIANA.

VOL. XI. *Third Series.* JULY, 1913.

No. 43.

"THE BACONIAN HERESY."

(Continued).

THE CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP OF THE PLAYS.

THE skill and subtlety of Mr. Robertson is again evident in the manner in which he opens and conducts the so-called enquiry into the classical scholarship. He commences by reminding the reader of the effectual manner in which "the legal argument" has been disposed of by the laying bare of the incomplete induction which its advocates followed. It has been already shown that Mr. Robertson has left the main argument unattacked. Then comes the preliminary flourish:—

"Substantially the same error we shall find made in respect of the inference that the plays of Shakespeare exhibit wide classical scholarship because they contain classical allusions and classical commonplaces. For in this case also the conclusion has been drawn without resort to the comparative method, which would reveal non-classical sources for Shakespeare's small classical knowledge."

It will not be difficult to prove to the reader that this is mere controversial rhetoric. It will be observed that Mr. Robertson definitely adopts the position that Shakespeare had "small classical knowledge," not

merely that his Latin was small and his Greek less. Then follows some skirmishing intended to impress but really immaterial to the issue, but it contains these sentences :—

"In the face of such a variety of ordinary sources for matters of ordinary classical knowledge, it is a sufficiently reckless course to credit Shakespeare with scholarly knowledge on the score of the very ordinary classical references to the plays. Here again orthodox writers are as deep in the fallacy as any of the Baconians. Long ago Dr. Farmer proved to the satisfaction of the scholars of his generation that the author of the plays had little classical scholarship, and that the instances put forward by Upton, Lewis Theobald and others, were reducible to English sources. The contrary thesis, however, has been zealously revived in recent times by two strongly anti-Baconian scholars—the late Professor Fiske and the late Professor Churton Collins—who drew upon the previous argumentation of Dr. Maguin and Professor Baynes. Having elsewhere discussed at length the 'classical' case put by these critics and by Mr. Greenwood, I will first deal with it mainly as it is put by Lord Penzance, who proceeds uncritically upon the data given him by Mr. Donnelly and upon the sweeping assertions of several 'orthodox' scholars.—See the Author's 'Montaigne and Shakespeare,' 2nd Edition, 1909, per Index."

Mr. Robertson thus side-slips the idolaters, Dr. Maguin, Professor Baynes, Professor Fiske, and Professor Churton Collins. Let it be remembered that the idolatrous orthodox Shakespearean scholars are the origin of all the pother. The Baconian thesis would never have been heard of but for their rash conclusions. Their names are paraded and then they are ingeniously set aside and the ground is chosen:—"I will first deal with it

mainly as it is put by Lord Penzance, who proceeds uncritically upon the data given him by Mr. Donnelly and upon the sweeping assertions of several ‘orthodox’ scholars.” But a section is devoted to Mr. Greenwood and others; by far the larger portion to the late William Theobald and good Dr. Theobald. The work of Judge Willis and Mr. Charles Crawford is requisitioned, and Mr. Robertson sails gaily on to select words used by Shakespeare which had a classical origin, but which he seeks to prove *might* have been obtained by him from English sources. Most of this work is unnecessary, and, if Professor Churton Collins had been attacked and silenced, Mr. Robertson might have claimed that he had made some advance in belittling Shakespeare. But, no; the real issue is carefully avoided.

Mr. Robertson is quite in error when he states that Dr. Farmer proved his case to the satisfaction of the scholars of his generation. Farmer did nothing of the sort. But the statement is a useful one for effect, as is also this extract from the Preface:—

“Nothing has ever made up for the turning away of Farmer from the task (the scholarly annotation of Shakespeare’s text) which he was so uniquely fitted to perform. His brief ‘Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare’ remains an unmatched performance of its kind after a century and a-half. At its close he made a half-promise to extract more elucidatory matter ‘from the chaos of papers’ from which he had compiled the essay; but the unkind fates set him to other work, and no man of equal scholarly opulence has put his hand to the task again.”

The reader shall have an opportunity of judging how far Farmer was capable of such a task as a scholarly annotation of Shakespeare’s text. Certainly the essay bears no evidence that he was. But it is a delusion to

say that he ever contemplated such a work. In the year before the production of the essay he had advertised and sought to obtain subscribers for what was to be his great work—"History and Antiquities of the Town of Leicester," his native town. He was far too desultory and ease-loving in his habits to finish it. The foregoing extract is founded on these words :—

"And when I am fairly rid of the dust of antiquity, which is at present very thick about me, and indeed more in quantity than I expected, you may very probably be troubled again with the ever-fruitful subject of Shakespeare and his commentators." All that he contemplated was another joist at the critics—a favourite diversion of the time with men of learning.

Farmer's Essay is unique in this respect—that in the long chain of works which have been published on the Shakespeare plays and poems it is the only one published separately which has attacked the learning contained in them.

Mr. Robertson felt lonely and so trotted out poor Dr. Farmer, made an idol of him, attributed to him an authority which he never had, in order to support his own unwarranted theory. There they stand, two forlorn, solitary figures crying in the wilderness, trying to make things seem what they are not.

First, let a test be made of how far Mr. Robertson may be relied on in the backing up which he claims he receives from Farmer :—

"Neither Mr. Collins nor Mr. Greenwood has made the slightest attempt to meet Farmer's point—that Taylor, the water-poet, who avowed his failure to get through the Latin accidence and his ignorance of all languages but his own, has a far greater number of classical allusions than occur in all Shakespeare's plays."

Mr. Robertson's is not a verbal quotation. The comparison was an after-thought of Farmer's. It does not appear in the first edition of the Essay, but the words in italics are inserted in that published in 1667:—"You perceive my dear Sir, how vague and indeterminate such arguments must be: *for in fact this sweet swan of Thames as Mr. Pope has called him, hath more scraps of Latin and allusions to antiquity than anywhere to be met with in the writings of Shakespeare.* I am sorry to trouble you with trifles, yet that must be done, when grave men insist upon them."

That Farmer should have made such a comparison between the works of Shakespeare and Taylor demonstrates how unreliable he is as a guide in literary criticism.

The following are the only references made to Taylor in the Essay:—

"You know honest John Taylor, the water-poet, declares that he never learn'd his Accidence, and that Latin and French were to him Heathen Greek; yet by the help of Mr. Whalley's argument, I will prove him a learned man in spite of everything he may say to the contrary."

Now comes the proof upon which Mr. Robertson says that Farmer states that Taylor "has a far greater number of classical allusions than occur in all the Shakespeare plays." For thus he makes a gallant address his Lady—

"Most inestimable Magazine of Beauty—in whom the Port and Majesty of Juno, the Wisdom of Jove's braine bred Girle, the Feature of Cytherea, &c., have their domestical habitation."

In the *Merchant of Venice* we have an oath "By two-headed Janus," and here (says Dr. Warburton)

Shakespeare shows his knowledge of the antique, and so again does the water-poet, who describes Fortune

"Like a Janus with a double face."

"But Shakespeare hath somewhere a Latin motto," quoth Dr. Sewel; "and so hath John Taylor, and a whole poem on it into the bargain."

There is only one other reference by Farmer to John Taylor.

Old Heywood, the epigrammist, addressed his readers long before:—

"Readers, reade this, thus : for Preface, *Proface*,
Much good do it you the poor repast here," &c.

Nor hath it escaped the quibbling manner of the *water-poet* in the "Title of a Poem," prefixed to his "Praise of Hempseed"—

"A Preamble, Preatot, Preagallop, Preface, or Preface; and
Proface, my masters, if your stomachs serve."

It may be noted that in the date of his writings Taylor was a successor, not a contemporary, of Shakespeare's. There were two trifles published in 1612 (on the death of Prince Henry) and in 1613 ("Heaven's Blessing and Earth's Joy") respectively. Publications bearing his name appeared from 1618 onwards, but the volume issued as "The workes of John Taylor the Water Poet" was not published until 1630.

This volume is one of the curiosities of the period. The title page states that the works are "sixty and three in number," and has on it an impression of the identical block which was used in printing *Venus and Adonis* in 1593, and in the 1611 quarto edition of the Authorised Version of the Bible. If the comparative method which Mr. Robertson so highly extols were applied to Taylor's

works there would be very little of Taylor left, even without any very exhaustive application of it. In the Epistle Dedicatory addressed to *The World* the suggestion is thrown out that the book may not have been written by Taylor. In a note prefixed to "Taylor's Pastoral" he disclaims the authorship of all writings bearing the initials I.T., although there are a number in the volume. In "a few lines to small purpose against the scandalous aspersions, that are either maliciously or ignorantly cast upon the Poets and Poems of these times," he writes:—

"Latin and French are heathen-Greek to me,
The Grecian, and the Hebrew Characters,
I know as well as I can read the Stars.
The sweet Italian, and the Chip Chop Dutch,
I know the man i'th Moone can speak as much."

In some lines at the end of "Sir Gregory Nonsense" he states, that "the meanest Scholler may plaine see I understand their tongues, as they doe me." Again and again are similar disclaimers made, and yet in certain portions of the works Latin quotations are freely used, and evidence is afforded that the author had a very extensive knowledge of classical writers and classical lore. Taylor's statements are entirely at variance with the testimony of many portions of the works. Farmer's comparison of Taylor and Shakespeare, which was adopted by Mr. Robertson, demonstrates that he was an untrustworthy critic, and was incapable from a lack of an intelligent understanding of contemporary literature of producing any commentary on the Shakespeare plays which would be of value.

Now let a definite test be made of Farmer's honesty, and if it be proved that in one of his main charges against his opponents he was either dishonest or culpably careless it will not be necessary to trouble the reader with any more of his feeble efforts. He writes,

"Prospero in the *Tempest* begins the address to his spirits,
'Ye Elves of Hills, of standing Lakes and Groves.'

"This speech, Dr. Warburton rightly observes to be borrowed from Medea's in 'Ovid'; and it proves, says Mr. Holt, beyond contradiction, that Shakespeare was perfectly acquainted with the sentiments of the ancients on the subject of enchantments. The original lines are these,

'Aurœque, et venti, montesque, amnesque, lacusque,
Diique omnes nemorum, diique omnes noctis adeste.'

"The translation of which by Golding is by no means literal, and Shakespeare hath closely followed it ;

'Ye Ayres and Winds ; Ye Elves of Hills, of Brookes, of Woods alone,
Of standing Lakes, and of the Night approache ye everych one.' "

Mr. Robertson discreetly omits mention of this, although it is one of Farmer's strong points. It is introduced thus : " But to come nearer to the purpose, what will you say, if I can show you, that Shakespeare, when, in the favourite phrase, he had a Latin Classick *in his eye*, must assuredly have made use of a translation." Why was all reference to this clinching argument omitted ? Because Mr. Robertson knew full well how Professor Churton Collins had dealt with the very passage. Dr. Maguin in two articles in *Blackwood's Magazine*, 1837, drew attention to the evidence which Farmer had ignored or misrepresented. He showed that if in this " crucial passage from the *Tempest* Shakespeare had followed Golding's version, he followed it only so far as suited his purpose, that he had the original in his hands or his memory, and had introduced touches from it." Professor Churton Collins thus deals with the matter :—

"As a test passage let us take the famous adaption in the *Tempest* (Act V. Sc. i.) :—

"Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes and groves
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.

by whose aid,
Weak masters, though ye be, I have bedimm'd
The noon-tide sun, call'd forth the mutinous winds.
To the dread rattling thunder
Have I given fire, and rifted Jove's stout oak
With his long bolt : the strong-bas'd promontory
Have I made shake ; and by the spurs pluck'd up
The pine and cedar : graves at my command,
Have wak'd their sleepers, op'd and led them forth
By my so potent art.

"This passage, according to Farmer, owes everything to Golding alone ; Golding's version of the original ("Metamorphous" VII. 197—206) is :—

'Ye ayres and winds, ye elves of hills, of brookes, of woodes alone
Of standing lakes, and of the night, approache ye everye one,
Through help of whom (the crooked bankes much wondering at
the thing)
I have compelled streames to run cleare backward to their spring.
By charms I make the calm seas rough ; and make the rough
seas playne,
And cover all the sky with cloudes, and chase from thence againe.
By charms I raise and lay the windes, etc.
And from the bowels of the earth both stones and trees do draw.
Whole woodes and forests I remove, I make the mountaines shake
And e'en the earth itself to moane and fearfully to quake.
I call up dead men from their graves
Our sorcerie dimmes the morning faire, and darks the sun at
noone.'

"Beside this place the original :—

'Auræque, et venti, montesque, amnesque, lacusque,
Dique omnes nemorum, Dique omnes noctis adeste :
Quorum ope, quum volui, ripis mirantibus amnes
In fontes rediere suos : concussaque sisto,
Stantia concutio cantu freta : nubila pello
Nubilaque induco : ventos abigoque, vocoque :

Vitaque saxa, suâ convulsaque roborâ terrâ,
Et sylvas moveo ; jubeoque tremiscere montes,
Et mugire solum, manes que exire sepulcris.'

"From this it will be clear that if Shakespeare used Golding's version—and this seems likely from the opening line—he used also the original. There is nothing in Golding corresponding to the original in '*sua convulsaque robora terrâ*,' which he omits entirely, but Shakespeare accurately recalls it in '*rifted Jove's stout oak*,' while the touch in '*op'd and let them forth*,' unfolds the meaning of '*exire*,' which Golding does not; so again Shakespeare represents '*voco*' — '*call'd forth*' — which Golding altogether misses. How admirably it may be added has Shakespeare caught the colour, ring and rhythm of the original, and how utterly are they missed in the lumbering homeliness of Golding."

Either Professor Churton Collins is right or he is wrong; the passage in the original and the translations of Shakespeare and Golding are there, so that each reader may decide for himself. If he is right, Farmer is convicted either of intentionally suppressing the truth in order to make a point against Dr. Warburton or of culpable carelessness or of lack of scholarship. In any case he stands discredited as an authority unworthy of credence. So Dr. Farmer, who has been dragged out of his deserved obscurity to try and bolster up the anti-Stratfordian case, may be relegated there again.

Before referring to further affirmative evidence in favour of the growing and indeed almost universal belief that the plays and poems were written by a man of great learning and culture, it is necessary to enter a protest against the charge made against Baconians that they are ignorant of contemporary literature. Again and again this is asserted in the "Baconian Heresy," but without an argument or a scrap of evidence in support of it. Allusion has already been made to Mr. Harold Bayley's "The Shakespeare Symphony." Mr. Parker Woodward has covered a very wide area in dramatic literature and poetry, especially in the works attributed to Kyd, Marlow, Peele, Greene, Nashe, Spenser, Lily, Watson and Burton. His recently published work "Tudor

Problems,"* exhibits a knowledge of contemporary historical and literary fact far greater than that displayed in "The Baconian Heresy."

Professor Churton Collins thus summarizes the result of his exhaustive investigation into the evidence afforded by the plays and poems that the author was acquainted with Latin:—

"His familiarity with the Latin language is evident first from the fact that he has with minute particularity of detail based a poem and a play on a poem of Ovid and a comedy of Plautus which he must have read in the original, as no English translations so far as we know existed at the time; secondly from the fact that he has adopted and borrowed many passages from the classics which were almost certainly only accessible to him in the Latin language; and thirdly from the fact that when he may have followed English translations it is often quite evident that he had the original either by him or in his memory.

"The story as told by Shakespeare follows the story as told by Ovid in the second book of the 'Fasti' ('Fasti' II. 721—852). It had also been told in English by four writers who had modelled their narratives on Ovid, by Chaucer in the 'Legende of Goode Women,' by Lydgate in his 'Falls of Princes,' by Gower in his 'Confessio Amantis,' and in prose by Painter in his 'Palace of Pleasure'; but a careful comparison of these narratives with Shakespeare's, which it is not necessary to give in detail here, will conclusively show that Shakespeare has followed none of them—that Ovid and Ovid only is his original. The details given in Ovid which neither Chaucer nor any of the other narrators reproduce, but which are reproduced by Shakespeare, place this beyond question."

And then follow a number of instances which prove the truth of this assertion up to the hilt. The writer continues:—

"In a word, a comparison of Chaucer's and Shakespeare's narratives will show that each represents an independent study of the Latin original, and that Shakespeare has followed Ovid with

scrupulous care. When this poem was written there was no English translation of the 'Fasti,' and Shakespeare must have read it in the original."

Mr. Robertson in endeavouring to refute an argument of Mr. Greenwood's urges that translations of the classics in manuscript were numerous in those days. He writes:—

"The reason for believing that MS. translations of Latin poetry were numerous in Shakespeare's day are manifold; and I confess to being astonished that anyone, even in the ardour of an *idée fixe*, should doubt its likelihood. . . . Did Mr. Greenwood never do such translations in his youth; and, if so, has he preserved them?"

These sentences prove that Mr. Robertson was unaware of the manner in which Latin was imparted to young boys in Shakespeare's time. There were no Latin-English grammars. No one required these translations. In the auction-rooms and book-shops many scores of manuscripts of the period have passed through the hands of the writer of this article during the past few years. They consist of transcripts of classical writers, always in the Latin language. These were common and have been preserved, but he cannot recollect to have seen one translation into English out of this number. It is much more probable that translations if they ever existed would survive rather than transcripts in the original language. Some of these latter have passed into the possession of the writer. "Juvenalis Satyræ," a quarto of 200 pages with a broad margin, is literally covered with Bacon's notes and marks. "Elegantiar Compendium Clarissimi Laurentii Vallæ," a large octavo of about 80 pages vellum, is in his handwriting, and on the last page contains some curious notes. A small octavo of about the same length, "Tibullus Elegæ," also in Bacon's handwriting, which comes from the library of Matthew, has been made the channel for

one of Bacon's usual tricks—an oblong space has been cut in the centre of the page so that the letters by the side of it and those seen through it spell BACON. T. M. The men of those days who were interested in the classics did not need translations. They thought and wrote in Latin. Classical works were uniformly annotated in Latin by scholars both in France and England. Out of some thousands of classical books annotated in manuscript which the writer has examined he cannot recollect to have seen *one* annotated in English.

Mr. Robertson does not state the manifold reasons for supposing that MS. translations were numerous in Shakespeare's day. Such evidence as exists is against this theory. Professor Churton Collins pertinently remarks :—

“If it be argued that he (Shakespeare) had access to manuscript translations, we can only reply that the balance of probability is very much more in favour of arguments based on facts than of arguments based on unsupported hypothesis, for of such translations there is no record.”

Mr. Robertson carries his case no further in his criticism of this point in Montaigne and Shakespeare. He advances no facts, substituting “ifs” and possibilities for them. He quotes, however, the statement of Dr. Anders, who wrote on “Shakespeare's books” :—“I think there ought to be no doubt that Shakespeare had recourse to the Latin direct.” Mention is made on the same page of the thesis of Dr. Ewig, “That Shakespeare's poem is based upon Livy no less than upon Ovid, and perhaps uses Chaucer also.” The copy of Livy which Bacon had when a young boy has been preserved. It is the 1535 edition of Froben. The margins bear evidence of the methodical character of his reading when he was probably about twelve years of age. They abound in sketches and in certain marks the use of which he continued during his life. On page

27 is a sketch of Lucrece, and under the words in his handwriting "*Bruti juram enem*" (the rest of the line has been cut off, and on the next line "*Tra Targum*").

Here are some more extracts from Professor Churton Collins' excellent work, "*Studies in Shakespeare.*"

"But what I wish to insist on is that Shakespeare read Seneca in the Latin original, not in the lumbering English version of Studley, Nevile, Newton, Nuce, and Jasper Heywood, published by Newton in 1581."

"Next let us take Horace. In Shakespeare's time there was no translation of the '*Odes*,' and yet his plays abound in what certainly appear reminiscences of them.'"

"Again, Juvenal was not translated into English until after Shakespeare's death, but that he had read him seems certain."

"It is difficult to believe that Shakespeare had not read Lucretius, and of Lucretius there was no translation until after the Elizabethan age."

"There remain to confine ourselves to works with all of which he was acquainted, and with some of which he was familiar, the '*Ænid*' of Virgil, the '*Metamorphoses*' and '*Heroides*' of Ovid, the Comedies of Terence, and the Tragedies of Seneca. Now in all cases where he refers to these works, or has borrowed or adapted from them, it is at least as probable, and this may be maintained with confidence, that he had the originals in his hands or his memory as that he had the English versions.'"

These statements are supported by citations from the works referred to which find their counterparts in Shakespeare.

Professor Churton Collins in his next article devotes his scholarship to answering the question, "*Had Shakespeare read the 'Greek Tragedies?'*" It is impossible here to do justice to the arguments which are used and the quantity of extracts which are given in support of them. No one interested in this subject should accept Mr. Robertson's emphatic pronouncement without refreshing his memory by again reading "*Studies in Shakespeare.*" It is far and away the most valuable contribution which has been made to the controversy.

One extract only will be given, which relates to the Attic dramas. It is this :—

“It is indeed in the extraordinary analogies—analogy in sources, in particularity of detail and point, and in relative frequency of employment, presented by his metaphors to the most convincing testimony of his familiarity with their writings.”

With such weighty arguments, based on what appears to be indisputable evidence, Mr. Robertson does not deal in the “Shakespeare Heresy.” He addresses his attention to what are termed “parallelisms.” On pages 202 to 216 he attacks 21 arguments which somebody has said somebody else has used. How strongly he would censure dealing with arguments at secondhand in others can be imagined. On pages 224 to 249 he comments one by one upon 64 instances brought forward by the late Mr. W. Theobald ; and on pages 276 to 373 on 223 instances brought forward by Dr. R. M. Theobald. With the assistance of the work done by Judge Willis and Mr. Charles Crawford, he seeks to minimize the value of the parallelisms as evidence that Bacon’s Works and Shakespeare’s Plays and Poems emanated from the same mind. He invariably deals with one word and not with the context, and seeks to show that the word with the same shade of meaning was used by other Elizabethan writers. Take one or two instances :—

“130 Person (=personna, part sustained, 2 Henry IV., IV., vii., 73). Bacon, Dr. Theobald points out, used the word in a similar sense. So did many other Elizabethan writers.”

Extracts are then given from a translation of Calvin’s “Sermons,” 1597, from Hooker’s “Ecclesiastical Polity,” from Hutchinson’s “Image of God,” and Fenton’s “Guicciardini,” 1579. He then adds :—

“Dr. Theobald does not seem to reflect that the classic meaning of *person* is implicit in the historic description of the Christian Trinity.”

Because Bishop Hooker, Roger Hutchinson and Geoffrey Fenton used the word in its original classical meaning it is no proof that the author of *Henry IV.* did not so use it. The extracts given rather confirm than confute Dr. Theobald's suggestion, for all three authors quoted were classical scholars. This argument is of a meretricious style, and piled up in great quantities has the effect of conveying the impression the reverse of true to a reader not versed in the subject. But it in no degree confutes the Baconian argument. Every word that Mr. Robertson has advanced in those 139 pages may be conceded to him (many of his contentions, however, may be successfully challenged), and the Baconian case is not affected by one jot or tittle.

It is the large number of parallel phrases which have been found in the writings of two authors in which the identity of thought and diction is obvious which constitutes the strength of the argument. Dr. Theobald gives 113 instances; but Mr. Edwin Reed, in his "Bacon and Shakespeare Parallelisms," gives no less than 885 examples, of which the following are a fair example:—

That strain again; it had a
dying fall;
O, it came o'er my ear like the
sweet south,
That breathes upon a bed of
violets,
Stealing and giving odor.

—*Twelfth Night* I. i.

By a divine instinct men's
minds mistrust
Ensuing danger; as by proof
we see
The waters swell before a
boist'rous storm.

—*Richard III.*, III.

The breath of flowers . . .
comes and goes, like the warbling music.

—Essay "On Gardening."

As there are . . . secret
swellings of seas before a
tempest so there are in States.

—Essay "On Sedition."

Let him be his carver.

—*Richard II.*, II. iii.

Nothing almost sees miracles
But misery.

—*King Lear* II. ii.

Who having unto truth by tell-
ing of it,
Made such a sinner of his
memory,
To credit his own lie.

—*Tempest* I. ii.

Have you a daughter ? . . .
Let her not walk i' th' sun.

—*Hamlet* II. ii.

I saw him run after a gilded
butterfly ; and when he caught
it, he let it go again ; and after
it again.—*Coriolanus* I. iii.

(The play is assumed to have
been written about 1610.
It was not published until
1623.)

It would beguile nature of her
custom,
So perfectly is he her ape.

—*Winter's Tale* V. ii. (1623).

You shall not be your own
carver. — "Advancement of
Learning."

Certainly if miracles be the
control over nature, they appear
most in adversity.

—Essay "On Adversity."

With long and continual
counterfeiting, and with oft
telling a lie, he was turned by
habit into the thing he seemed
to be ; and from a liar became
a believer.—"Henry VII."

Aristotle dogmatically as-
signed the cause of generation
to the sun.

—"Novum Organum."

To be like a child following a
bird, which, when he is nearest,
flying away and lighteth a little
before : and then the child
after it again.

—Private letter to Greville,
written in 1595, not pub-
lished until 1657.

Governed by chance, custom
doth commonly prove but an
ape of nature.—"Advancement
of Learning."

It must be repeated that Mr. Edwin Reed gives 885 parallelisms, of which the above are a fair example ! The Baconians say in them lies a strong argument that the two sets of works were produced by one mind. The skilful controversialist again side-tracks the real argument and tries to persuade the reader that a side issue is the main issue. To accomplish this he again charges Baconians with ignorance of contemporary literature, talks about comparative study of this literature as if he

had discovered the method, when Baconians have been working it for all it is worth for years, heaps up extraneous quotations which do not affect the Baconian argument, and then writes :—

"I will not carry the 'quest' further. It has its distressing as well as its ridiculous side. These divagations of men utterly possessed by a foregone conclusion, blind to all countervailing evidence, hypnotized by a hallucination, tell of an 'expense of spirit' in error that is not to be contemplated without discomfort. It is the desire to minimize the amount of such aberration in future that has sustained me, as I trust it may do some of my readers, through the tedium of a detailed confutation."

It is the irony of fate that, in the future, Baconians will hold up the outcome of all this tedious labour as one of the strongest arguments in favour of their theory. When Mr. Robertson has produced not 885 but 100 parallelisms from the works of Shakespeare and some other contemporary author, parallelisms as identical in diction and thought as those now quoted, he may have the right to be listened to ; until then he must subside.

There is another view of Mr. Robertson's attempt to rebut the argument from classical scholarship to which attention must be drawn. Judge Willis, on whom the controversialist mainly relies, had read extensively the writings of Divines, ecclesiastical records and correspondence extant at the time. He draws his materials principally from these sources. He quotes from Rolls of Parliament, 1436 ; Beggar's Petition Against Popery, 1538 ; State Papers of Henry VIII., 1546 ; Commission of Edward VI. to his Council, 1552 ; The King's Authorization, Preface to Constitutional Canon's Ecclesiastical, 1604 ; various translations of Calvin's works, viz., on "Deuteronomy" ; on "The Harmony of

the Evangelists”; Sermons; Tyndale’s translation of Erasmus’ “Enchiridion,” 1533; Philpot’s translation of Curio’s “Defence of Christ’s Church,” c. 1550; Hooker’s “Ecclesiastical Polity”; John Rainhold’s lecture on “Obadiah,” 1584; Hutchinson’s “The Image of God,” and his other works; Hooper’s “Declaration of Christ and His Office”; Whitehorne’s “Arte of Warrs,” 1560; and to numbers of similar works. All of these, be it observed, are the works of classical scholars. To these out-of-the-way books and manuscripts has Judge Willis to have resort to produce examples of words used in their classical sense as Shakespeare used them! Does Mr. Robertson suggest that the Stratford man had covered this wide field of literature and made it his own before he wrote *Venus and Adonis*? If not, what does his argument amount to? Not one contemporary author is quoted who was not a classical scholar! Judge Willis proves this and no more—that the author of the poems and plays was so familiar with the writings of classical scholars that he employed words which were used by them in their root meaning. “The Baconian Mint” was, like Farmer’s Essay, becoming forgotten except by Baconians, who like to keep such trophies on their shelves. Mr. Robertson drags them forth to replenish the Baconian armoury. That is the net result of his labours.

In respect of this point Mr. Robertson on page 272 very unfairly and without justification brings a charge of equivocation against Dr. Theobald and, in doing so, makes this statement:—“Any Englishman of Shakespeare’s day, whether he knew Latin or not, used those words in the so-called ‘classic’ sense, if he used them at all, simply because they had been introduced and adopted in the past by men who were habituated in Latin.” *Judge Willis does not give one single instance of the use of one of these*

words by a writer who was not a classical scholar. And yet Mr. Robertson has the assurance to attribute their use to "any Englishman of Shakespeare's day, whether he knew Latin or not." Equally loose is the remark on page 451: "All this is Elizabethan commonplace." Equally loose is Mr. Robertson when, on page 254, in referring to Hallam's observations on Shakespeare's forced Latinisms, he remarks that he "has here, as we shall see, half claimed uniqueness for a number of Shakesperean words which were more or less current before 1590." To justify his rash statements he cites one example of the use of each of three words by classical writers.

The principle upon which Mr. Robertson acts throughout his book is that any statement made by any man, however distinguished he may be as an authority, is to be contradicted, whether it be right or wrong, if it in any way supports the Baconian theory. In this direction he says, on page 255: "The writer [*i.e.*, Hallam] who would have counted the Baconian theory insane becomes a stepping-stone thereto." Hallam was a man of the widest knowledge in literature, and he has not left one single sentence which justifies Mr. Robertson's deduction.

(To be continued.)

THE DATES OF SPENSER'S BIRTH AND DEATH.

THE 1679 Folio of Spenser's poetical works contains as a frontispiece a picture of the monumental tablet erected to the poet in Westminster Abbey, and this picture is sufficiently large to enable the epitaph on the tablet to be clearly set out. The striking peculiarity of this is that the date of Spenser's birth is thereon given as 1510, and of his death as 1596. These dates are most extraordinary, and do not at all agree with the accepted facts of the poet's life—that, as a young man, in 1579, he first began to write love poems and love ditties, when, if born in 1510, he would be 69 years of age. In the 1679 Folio there is a short sketch of Spenser's life, and the writer of this, whoever he was, coolly accepts and even endorses this incongruous birth date, without any cavil or attempt at explanation. I pointed all this out and dwelt upon it in the little book I brought out in 1911, entitled "*Bacon's Secret Disclosed in Contemporary Books.*"* That the date would not fit Spenser the poet, as we knew him, or imagined him to be, is quite apparent; but it was equally apparent that this date was accepted by his contemporaries, or those who lived soon after him. And herein lies the puzzle. So incongruous did the date appear to be, as time went on, that in 1778, when the worn and defaced tablet was "restored by private subscription," the restorers coolly changed the dates, and made them as they now appear in Westminster Abbey—"born in 1553 and died in 1598"; and had it not been for the picture of the tablet preserved in the 1679 Folio, and in one other place that I will speak of, no one would ever probably

* Gay & Hancock, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, W.C. 1911.

have known that these "restorers" had had the sublime effrontery to change the dates on such a solemn record as a monumental tablet without a word of explanation. They found that the dates would not suit the poems, so they changed the dates as being easier than explaining the poems.

This subject has interested me a good deal, and I have endeavoured to unearth what other contemporary allusions there may be to this curious tablet of Spenser's, and what, if any, contemporary explanation there may be of these dates.

There is a Latin-English version of Spenser's "Shepherd's Calendar," made by Theodore Bathurst, and first published in 1653. This was again brought out by John Ball in 1732. To this is prefixed a short life of Spenser (in Latin), and in this the author quotes (in English) the epitaph from the Westminster tablet, with the dates 1510 and 1596. He then goes on to say that Cambden reports that Spenser died ("*immatura morti*," by a too early death) in 1598; and this date was adopted by Winstanley in 1684 and 1687 in his "Lives of England's Worthies"; but neither Cambden nor Winstanley mention any date of birth. A little further on John Ball discusses the 1510 birth date, and says it is in no way consistent with truth that he was born in that year, because that would make him past 60 years of age when he sent forth the "Shepherd's Calendar," and that was not exactly the age for a man to give himself up to drawing love pictures, which was evidently the line of argument that the "restorers" followed in 1778. But John Ball adds that what is worth more than all argument is the Register of the Cambridge University, though unfortunately he neglects to tell us what he inferred from this Register, or what it recorded.

Going back a few years from the date of this publication of John Ball's, we come to the survey of the Abbey

Church of St. Peter's, Westminster, taken in the year 1723, by John Dart, and published by him, together with an account of the Abbots and the Abbey, some time soon after that year. This was brought out in two sumptuous volumes, with splendid engravings showing the principal tombs and tablets.

Among these engravings there is a large picture of Spenser's tablet (Vol. I., p. 75), and in this picture the epitaph can be clearly read, as in the case of the frontispiece of the 1679 Folio. The picture is precisely similar to that of the Folio, and the epitaph is identical in respect of arrangement of lines, spelling and dates. John Dart has also a short account, descriptive and critical, of this tablet and its epitaph. He gives Cambden's Latin epitaph, and its allusion to Spenser's "too early death," and points out also that while Cambden gives the date of death as 1598, he mentions no date at all of birth. But that this epitaph was ever placed on the monument, Dart says, is "doubtful"; certainly there is no place for it, as the picture shows. John Dart then goes on to say:

"But what has raised the chief dispute concerning this Epitaph, is the date of Mr. Spenser's birth, which upon the Tomb was said to be in 1510. This indeed squares but ill with Mr. Cambden's expression of an early Death. Yet however (if poetically plac'd) may only relate to the too hasty Loss of such a Man, and allude to his Merit, rather than his Years. That Mr. Spenser was an old Man at his death is generally suppos'd; but of what age is doubtful, and was perhaps when this Inscription was plac'd here, which was not till the Year 1631; and therefore this of 1510, being added to supply the Vacancy, requires no great Stress to be laid upon it."

From which remarks we may gather that John Dart

smoothed over the difficulty of the birth date, for himself at any rate, by assuming that the date was stuck in to "supply the Vacancy" without much thought as to its correctness. Perhaps he had in mind the contemptuous words of Fletcher in "The Purple Island," * when he wrote of Spenser—

"Poorly, poor man, he lived : poorly, poor man, he died."

And concluded that the date of the birth of such an one—whether 40 years one way or another—would not be a matter of much importance.

This may have been Dart's mind on the subject, but it is quite impossible to believe that such could have been the mental position of the man who wrote the short biography of Spenser prefixed to the 1679 Folio, gave a picture of the monumental tablet as a frontispiece to his book, and had clearly and unmistakably adopted the birth date of 1510 as that to be adhered to.

This is what he said of Spenser—

"He excelled all other ancient and modern Poets, in Greatness of Sense, Decency of Expression, Height of Imagination, Quickness of Conceit, Grandeur and Majesty of Thought, and all the Glories of Verse. When he is passionate, he forces commiseration and tears from his Readers; where pleasant and airy, a secret satisfaction and smile: and where Bold and Heroique, he inflames their breasts with Gallantry and Valour. His Descriptions are so easie and natural, that his Pen seems to have a power of conveying Ideas to our mind, more Just, and to the Life, than the exquisite Pencils of Titian or Raphael, to our eyes. He was, in a word, compleatly happy in everything that might render him Glorious, and Inimitable to future Ages."

Greater praise than this it would be impossible to

* "The Purple Island," by P. F., Cambridge, 1633, Cant. I., Stanza 19.

give. Spenser is here exalted on a pinnacle above "all other Ancient and Modern Poets." How can we reconcile this with Fletcher's—

"Poorly, poor man, he lived : poorly, poor man, he died" ?

Or how can we reconcile it with the fact that the unknown author of the above pæan of praise at the same time accepts the incongruous date of birth that would make his poet-hero an old man of 69 when he first began (as a youth) to write love songs ? There is some mystery here that requires clearing up. It would certainly seem as though two totally distinct and different "Spensers" were being spoken of, even as Ben Jonson speaks of and praises two very different "Shakespeares."

There is yet another 17th century writer to be noticed who has recorded Spenser's monumental tablet. This is Thomas Dingley in his "History from Marble." This book contains an account, with beautiful pen-and-ink sketches, of various tombs and tablets throughout England and Wales, and was compiled by Dingley, probably with the assistance of Theophilus Alys, throughout the years between 1640—1680. It was never published, but was reproduced in facsimile from the MS. by the Camden Society in 1868, Vols. XCIV. and XCVII.

Dingley gives at p. 471 an exact reproduction of the epitaph on Spenser's tablet. There is no picture of the tablet, but the epitaph is given line for line, and with the same spelling as reproduced by the other writers I have brought forward, except that Dingley has different dates. His epitaph concludes—

HE WAS BORNE IN LONDON IN
THE YEARE 1516: AND
DIED IN THE YEARE
1598.

11

It is certainly curious that Dingley, professing to copy

the tablet, should make such a variation in the dates, and should hit upon the very date of Spenser's death that was afterwards adopted by the restorers of the tablet. It is quite possible that 1516 might be a slip of the pen for 1510, as the o in Dingley's notes might easily be misread for a 6, but the mistake of the 8 is not so easily understood.

There can, I think, be no doubt that the dates were originally 1510 and 1596. We have had handed down to us two pictures of the tablet—one published in 1679, the other in 1723—each from quite independent sources the one from the other, and each absolutely agreeing the one with the other. The descriptive matter with these pictures also accepts these dates. There is also the testimony of John Ball, before given, that reports the dates 1510 and 1596, though not accepting them without cavil. There is no testimony to be found anywhere supporting the birth-date of 1553 among Spenser's contemporaries, or those living near his time.

And thus the puzzle stands, and I fear with our present information we can get no nearer the solution of it. I do not doubt but that there will be found some explanation of it all when the grand clearing up takes place of the mystery of the English literature of those 100 years from 1570 to 1670. When all is understood about that period, there will be a great tumbling down of statues erected to departed "great ones" and a great scrapping of "biographies" and literary criticism that modern ingenuity has built up.

The spelling of Spenser's name even invites discussion. Mr. Smedley, in a correspondence in the public Press, lately drew attention to the fact that the name was frequently spelt with a "c" instead of an "s," and he was informed, editorially, in the usual *de haute en bas* style that, of course, "s" was the correct way. But in the Westminster tablet, the present one as well

as that which it replaced, it is spelt with a "c." In Bathurst's translation of the "Shepherd Calendar" (1653), on the English title-page it is spelt with a "c," and on the Latin with an "s." On the title-page to the 1679 Folio it is spelt with an "s," but in the same volume on the sub-title-page to the "Prothalamion" it is spelt with a "c." John Ball, in quoting Camden's epitaph, spells it with a "c"; and John Dart (1723), following the spelling on the tablet, of which he gives a picture, spells it with a "c." So I think it is by no means certain how the name should be spelt if one wished to spell it correctly.

GRANVILLE C. CUNNINGHAM.

THE WITCHES IN *MACBETH*.

IN *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal* of April 27, 1844, attention is called to Knight's recently published "Biography of Shakespeare," and we are told that "the witches of *Macbeth* are a very peculiar creation. Witchcraft was not then rife in England."

In 1591, in an Edinburgh witch case, it was testified that several hags went "together" to sea, "each one in a riddle or sieve."

In 1596-7 Commissions for the trial of witches sat at Aberdeen and put to death twenty-one persons charged with witchcraft. In the records of these trials we read that Isabel Oig was accused of laying the wind; Violet Leys of haunting a vessel with bad winds so that the master was obliged to cast overboard the greater part of the lading or there to perish—men, ship and gear. These records seem to be embodied in *Macbeth* I. iii., where we read:—

Witch 1.—A saylor's wife had chestnuts in her lappe

And mouncht and mouncht and mouncht :
 Give me, quoth I.
 Aroynt thee, witch, the rumpe-fed Ronyon cries,
 Her husband's to Aleppo gone Master o' th' Tiger
 And like a Rat without a tayle^o
 Ile doe, Ile doe and Ile doe.

Wilch 2.—Ile give thee a winde.

E. D.'L.

AN ASTRONOMICAL SIMILITUDE.

HUNDREDS—nay, thousands—have been the references made to the lines bearing the signature of Ben Jonson prefixed to the 1623 edition of Shakespeare's works. Sweet "Swan of Avon" has been quoted tens (if not hundreds) of thousands of times; "and though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek" has been misquoted nearly as many. And yet the most significant lines in the whole panegyric have almost, if not quite, escaped attention. The passage which far and away exceeds all others in importance is this :—

"But stay ! I see thee in the Hemisphere
 Advanc'd, and made a constellation.
 Shine forth, thou Starre of Poets"

Jonson certainly had sufficient knowledge of astronomy to differentiate between a group of stars, a constellation, and a star. What did he intend to convey by this curious prophecy in metaphor? Why in the distant future should the author be likened to a constellation?

The influence which the coterie of young French writers known as the Pléiade exerted in France at the time the Shakespeare plays were being written is well

* Witches were believed to be able to change themselves and others into animals, but such witch creations were always supposed to be tailless.

known.* There is not to be found in contemporary English literature any reference which would lead to the belief that the work of the Pléiade was either recognised or understood in England. It is, however, beyond doubt that Francis Bacon must have been familiar with the men who constituted the group and with their work. He was in France from 1576 to 1579, and again in 1581, when their fame at the Court was at its zenith. Although he does not in terms refer to them, there are several passages in the "Advancement of Learning" which inferentially point to his knowledge of and appreciation of their work. Edmund Spenser, Joshua Silvester, and others, translated odes by Du Bellay and Ronsard. Sir Sidney Lee has pointed out the influence which the Pléiade exercised over Shakespeare and some of his contemporaries. Jonson has left no evidence which justifies the assumption that he was acquainted with the contemporary literature of other countries. It is remarkable how slender are the grounds upon which he has obtained the reputation of being a learned man. But this is certain—that, having regard to the relations which existed between Bacon and Jonson from 1620 onwards, in view of the epoch-making work of the members of the Pléiade and Bacon's knowledge of it, Jonson could not have been otherwise than familiar with it.

The Pléiade is a group of seven stars in the constellation of Taurus. It was to the seven young men who were the backbone of the French Renaissance that their countrymen applied the designation. They were animated by a sincere and intelligent love of their mother-tongue; but, recognising its crudeness and insufficiency, they sought to bring the French language and literary forms to a state more comparable with that of the

* A brief account of this remarkable movement will be found in "The Mystery of Francis Bacon" (R. Banks and Son).

two great classical tongues. The language and literary forms of the English tongue in 1576 were far inferior to those of France in 1549, when Du Bellay, Ronsard and their associates entered upon their enterprise. And yet by the time the Folio edition of "Shakespeare" was published, a language and literature had been created in England which in its capacity was not inferior to that of France. Further, in the Shakespeare plays, examples of that language had been produced which, even after the lapse of nearly three hundred years, occupy the foremost position in the literature of the world. The remarkable feature of this Renaissance is that it appears to have been brought about by, *with one striking exception*, a very mediocre lot of men.

Now, let the passage under consideration in the panegyric be examined. Jonson had in his mind the Pléiade and their work for France. He had also before him the corresponding work, of even wider import, which had been carried through in England. He was writing lines to be prefixed to the culmination of that work. If the seven men who brought about the French Renaissance were likened to a group of stars, to what must that man be likened who had been the Alpha and Omega of the English Renaissance?—the man who, concealed under other names, had in so many divers directions brought into existence the foundations of a literature which was destined to become more influential than those of the great classical tongues and hardly less powerful in its capacities. Jonson looked into the future and with prophetic vision saw the results of this great work, and so he penned the lines:—

" But stay ! I see thee in the Hemisphere
Advanc'd, and made a constellation."

No group of stars were worthy of comparison to him ; he must have a whole constellation to himself. He was

the Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, &c., in it. But centuries might elapse before the constellation would be recognised.

"Shine forth, thou Star of Poets."

Jonson knew the difference between a star and a constellation. Shakespeare was likened to a brilliant,—the most brilliant star in that constellation. The constellation was Francis Bacon.

WILLIAM T. SMEDLEY.

THREE POINTS OF INTEREST.

IT is a suggestive fact that whenever Elizabethan students, however orthodox, express themselves with freedom and honesty, their conclusions generally tend to prove the theory held by Baconians.

In an edition of "The Essays of Francis Bacon," with introduction and notes by "Mary Augusta Scott, Ph.D., Professor of the English Language and Literature in Smith College," U.S.A. (published 1908), the editress makes, among others, the following statements as the result of her careful and painstaking works:—

"Illustrations from King James' Bible and from Shakspeare are the best to be had to explain the English of Bacon's 'Essays,' for the three great classics are almost as precisely contemporaneous as it is possible to be. Making the citations without forethought just as they occurred to me, I found on completing the notes that all the thirty-seven plays of Shakspeare had been called into requisition to illustrate Bacon's fifty-eight essays.

"One reason why Bacon's 'Essays,' one of the most learned works in English, is so easy to read and to understand is that the language used is that of the Bible,

both in vocabulary and construction. The word 'marvel' meaning to wonder, 'wax' to grow, 'profit' to improve, need no explanation to the reader of the Authorised Version."

Dr. Scott is not a Baconian, and, unfortunately, she does not even understand the true character of the author she is editing; but her freedom from prejudice makes her work valuable and tempts one to wonder what the result will be when not only Bacon's fifty-eight essays, but all his works, including letters and fragments, are "called into requisition" to illustrate "Shakespeare's" thirty-seven plays.

Another frank utterance from a different source also points to the theory suggested by Mr. Smedley—that "King James' Bible," although translated by a number of bishops, was revised and put into final form by one master-genius.

At the recent annual dinner of the Royal General Theatrical Fund held on May 22nd, Sir G. Alexander, according to a newspaper report, thus quotes his friend, Sir Arthur T. Quiller Couch, in reference to the double miracle of Shakespeare and the English Bible:—The latter (he said) was the "greater miracle; for individual genius, such as Shakespeare, we may allow to come in the course of nature. But how forty-seven men—not one known outside of this performance for any superlative talent—could have brought that marvel to birth, and after no very long gestation—well, he had a somewhat sceptical mind, but admitted that, before such a wonder as that, the sceptical mind must stand humble and aghast."

It is a step in advance that both "Shakespeare" and our English Bible are admitted as "miracles" and "a wonder," and it is to be hoped that after honest minds have "wondered on" for a while, "truth" will assert itself and "make all things plain."

It may be an admirable attitude to "stand humble

and aghast," but it is still more admirable to do justice to the God-given genius, literary and dramatic, of our greatest Englishman, Francis Bacon, as author of the supreme dramas and reviser of that "marvel" of literature—the Authorized English Version of the Bible.

Perusing lately the introductory essay to the old-fashioned "Family Library" edition of *Æschylus*, it was interesting to read that the great Greek dramatist, "an early and ardent admirer of Homer, used modestly to say, in allusion to the great benefit he derived from his [Homer's] works to his own tragedies, that he had been to a great feast of poetry and had brought away some of the scraps."

The figure of speech was familiar, and made one wonder where Shakespeare had found this little bit of ore of which he makes such excellent use in *L. L. L.* V. i. 40.

I have not so far been able to find the original statement, but an appeal to *Notes and Queries* has elicited the fact that there is a reference to *Æschylus*' modest remark in the "*Deipnosophistæ*" of *Athenæus*, who was himself possibly guided by it to the choice of his title, "*Banquet, or Feast of Wisdom.*" The passage, which a friend has been good enough to translate for me, is as follows ;—

"The words of the noble and illustrious *Æschylus* who declared that his own tragedies were crumbs from the great banquets of Homer."

It is impossible to doubt that Shakespeare had the words of the Greek tragedian in his mind when he makes *Moth* say of *Holofernes* and *Nathaniel*—

"They have been at a great feast of languages and have stolen the scraps."

It adds force to the satire on pedantry and affectation

when we realise that it is the reverse side of Æschylus' profound respect for *true* learning and genius. It is at the same time another of the many proofs that "Shakespeare" was not dependent on translations for the material wherewith to build his immortal "Palace of Truth."

H. H. S.

IS THIS A BACON SIGNATURE IN THE SHAKESPEARE SONNETS?

IN Shakespeare's Sonnet No. 136, the writer states that his name is "Will."

"Make but my name thy love, and love that still,
And then, thou lovest me, for my name is 'Will.'"

This insistence that the name of the writer of the Sonnets is "Will" led me to seek a possibly concealed name, either as an anagram or concealed in the numbered letters of the alphabet (of twenty-four letters only, *i* and *j* being interchangeable, as were also *u* and *v*), as used in the prevailing ciphers of the 16th century.

I have reached a result. Is it convincing? Lines 8 to 14 of Sonnet 136 read thus. (The italics are mine.)

"Among a number, *one* is reckon'd none :
Then in the number let *me* pass untold,
Though in thy store's account *I one* must be ;
For nothing hold me, so it please thee hold
That nothing me, a something sweet to thee :
Make but my name thy love, and love that still,
And then thou lovest me, for my name is 'Will.'"

Following these hints I applied them to the word "Will," viz. :

W is the twenty-first letter of the alphabet.

I "Then in the number let me pass untold,
Though in thy store's^a account *I one* must be."
(See the Sonnet)

L equals 50	}	double L equals 100, or C.
L equals 50		

* Worcester's dictionary cites "store treasure" from Bacon as meaning "accumulated."

APPLICATION OF THE ABOVE

W is 21 } 2 is second letter in alphabet.
 1 is first letter in alphabet.

I "must pass untold" (See Sonnet)

LL as shown above equals

I "Though in thy store's account I one must be"

B
A
C
O
N
E

I find in *Love's Labour Lost*, Act IV., Scene ii., a justification of my use of the double L (LL) as signifying one hundred in analysing the letters of the name WILL in Sonnet 136 of Shakespeare.

"If Sore be Sore, then L to Sore makes fifty Sores one Sorel !
 Of one Sore I a hundred make by adding but one more L."

Thus I find that WILL equals BACONE.

Now Bacone is Francis Bacon, for in 1621 Sir John Davies published "Selected Odes of Horace, Epigrams, Anagrams, and Epitaphs," and in it is the following anagram :

To the Right Honorable
 Sir Francis Bacone Knight
 Lord High Chancellor of England.

Anagram { Bacone
 Beacon

"Thy Virtuous name and office
 Joyne with Fate
 To make thee the bright Beacon of the State."

Also in the "Manes Verulamiani," poems published after Francis Bacon's death and addressed to him, *Bacone* is mentioned seventeen times. *Vide* poems Nos. 9, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, in the Harleian Miscellany X., pp. 287, ff., London, 1813—reprint of the Editio Princeps by John Haviland, London, 1626.

During four months after finding the above signature, I was unable to discover that the name of Francis Bacon was ever written Bacone. The anagram of John Davies, of Hereford, and the many instances in the "Manes" were worth waiting for.

LUCY DERBY FULLER.

Boston, March 12, 1913.

THE ANNUAL DINNER.

THE Members of the Society dined together at the Trocadero Restaurant on the 22nd of January, 1913, to celebrate the 352nd Anniversary of the birth of Francis Bacon.

The President, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Bart., presided over a large gathering. After the usual loyal toasts had been honoured Mr. Harold Hardy proposed "The Immortal Memory of Francis Bacon" in the following speech :—

In proposing the toast, "The memory of Francis Bacon," I am reminded of an incident a few months ago, when Mr. Balfour came to Gray's Inn to unveil the statue of Bacon in South Square. On that occasion Mr. Balfour told us that he had been invited by the Benchers to make a speech, and from the moment he accepted the invitation he had been regretting it. Of course, he referred to the greatness of the subject. And you can readily imagine that, if Mr. Balfour felt uneasy about the task before him, I am overwhelmed with the responsibility of proposing this toast. I feel great sympathy at the present moment with that gentleman who was called upon to propose the toast of Literature, and he said the subject filled him with sorrow and regret, "because," he explained, "Shakespeare is dead, Milton is no more, and I myself am feeling far from well." It is a great responsibility, because we are met to-night to celebrate a memory very precious to the members of this Society, who think of Bacon not merely as an eminent statesman and sage philosopher, but a poet, an orator, a great master of the English language, and, as we believe, the founder and creator of our English literature. It has been said that the ideal life divides itself into three parts—the first devoted to study, the second to action, and the third to reflection. If this be so, the ideal was at least in this way achieved in Bacon's case, for his life may be divided into three clearly-defined periods. There is the early life of study and contemplation before he began to practise at the Bar; the period of active life as lawyer and statesmen, when he filled the office of Solicitor and Attorney-General, Lord Keeper, and Lord Chancellor; and finally in the winter of his years after his fall, when he retired to

Gray's Inn and devoted himself to the production of works for the benefit of mankind. I would ask you not to be alarmed, for I am not going to deal with all those periods to-night. But the picture of Bacon which I would present to you is this—"a man naturally fitted for literature rather than for anything else, and borne by some destiny against the inclination of his genius into the business of active life." That is the description of Bacon in his own words, and it is certainly a true description, for there is no doubt that the adoption of the legal profession by Bacon was not due to choice or personal inclination, but to the force of circumstances following upon his father's death. Originally, it was intended by Sir Nicholas Bacon that both his sons, Anthony and Francis, should qualify for the Bar, because they were placed under a law tutor, named Richard Barker, shortly after leaving Cambridge, on their admission to Gray's Inn in the summer of 1576. But a few months afterwards there was a change of plans, and Francis, probably at his own request, was allowed to travel abroad with Sir Amyas Paulet, the English Ambassador to the French Court. Francis remained on the Continent for nearly three years, and on the death of his father at the beginning of 1579 he returned to England and took up his residence in a set of chambers in Gray's Inn, which he occupied, more or less, during the remainder of his life. From that time down to the year 1594, when he first appeared in Court, this man of contemplations led a somewhat secluded life. He had a country house at Twickenham, where he stayed from time to time. He occasionally rode over to Gorhambury and visited his mother. He was a Member of Parliament, but Parliament seldom met, and when it did meet it only lasted for a few months. Sometimes, also, he attended at the Court. In other respects his life was private, devoted to study and contemplations, and the production of works for the benefit of mankind. He was conscious of great intellectual gifts, and some people described him as arrogant. He confided to his uncle, Lord Burleigh, that he had taken all knowledge to be his province. But his zeal was taken for ambition. He was thoroughly misunderstood. Like another youthful genius, he committed the crime of being a young man. That may sound strange, perhaps, to many people, who seem to regard Bacon as a sort of Peter Pan, only *vice versa*. Peter Pan was the boy who never grew up, and they picture Bacon as a man who never was young. He was certainly precocious. He was a

youth of tremendous industry, a great reader of books, and his memory as well as his judgment was phenomenal. He lived among the ancients, as he tells us, and it is manifest from his writings that he had read and digested all the Greek and Roman literature. It is sometimes pointed out that his quotations were faulty, but, according to his secretary (Dr. Rawley), he had acquired the habit of memorising what he read, and frequently gave the effect of what an author said rather than the precise words used. He was constantly altering and adapting quotations. "After he had surveyed the records of antiquity," says Gilbert Wat, "after the volumes of men, he betook himself to the volume of the world; and having mastered all that books possessed—his spacious spirit not thus bounded—he set upon the kingdom of Nature and carried the victory very far." His researches covered the whole field of history and philosophy, as well as poetry, which he enthusiastically describes as a "dream of learning." He was a poet and drank deep of the waters of "Parnassus." To Burleigh he writes: "Not as a man born under Sol, who loveth honour; nor under Jupiter, who loveth business; for the contemplative planet carrieth me away wholly." Again, to Essex he protests that he is "not much in appetite nor much in hope; for as for appetite, the waters of 'Parnassus' are not as the waters of the spa, which give a stomach, but rather they quench the appetite and desire." For fifteen years the most exquisitely constructed intellect that ever was bestowed upon any of the children of men—to quote Macaulay's phrase—was actively engaged on "works of recreation," as Bacon called them, in the solitude of his chambers in Gray's Inn. The year 1594 marks the transition from the private or contemplative life of the poet and philosopher to the active or public life of the lawyer and statesman. This distinction was ever present to the mind of Bacon, who, by a sort of mental detachment, separated the contemplative from the active life. And although biographers attach more importance to his professional and political career, it was contemplations, dreams, and inventions for the benefit of the human race which dominated his thought and obsessed his mind.

We see this over and over again in his letters and other writings. To Bodley he writes in 1605:—

"I think no man can more truly say with the Psalmist, 'My soul hath been a stranger in her pilgrimage.' For since I was of

any understanding my mind hath in effect been absent from that I have done, and in absence are many errors, which I willingly acknowledge, and among the rest this great one, which led the rest, that knowing myself by inward calling to be fitter to hold a book than play a part, I have led my life in civil causes, for which I was not very fit by nature, and more unfit by the pre-occupation of my mind." In the dedication of his essays to his beloved brother Anthony, he says, "I sometimes wish that your infirmities might be translaied upon myself, that her majesty might have the service of so active and able a mind, and I might be with excuse confined to these contemplations and studies for which I am fitted."

Throughout Bacon's life the same idea prevailed, and even when he is raised to the Bench, on his appointment as Lord Keeper, he refers in his speech in Chancery to the trend of his natural inclinations. "The depth of the three vacations," he pleads, "I would reserve in some measure free for the study of the arts and sciences, to which in my nature I am most inclined."

The poetic faculty was powerful in Bacon's mind, says Macaulay. He was a visionary in the midst of business and affairs. A State paper by Bacon is a literary gem; for even in legal and political treatises what might otherwise be dull and heavy matter becomes interesting for the picturesque phrasing, the delightful turns of fancy, the poetic imagery which characterise all Bacon's writings. His discourse on the union of the two kingdoms, with its analogies to Nature, reveals the poet and the man of contemplations. The same characteristic is manifest in his political speeches, for he was equally master of the phrase which gives an impression to the senses as well as of the logical argument which appeals to reason. His method of oratory was a matter of comment among the men of his time. There is a record of "Notes in Parliament," dated 1626, in which a contemporary states: — "Sir Fra. Bacon introduced his matter with poetry and history. He was a man most elegant though likened to a meteor."

There is abundant testimony to the poetic gifts of Francis Bacon. I will only trouble you with two quotations. Professor Blackie says, "Another virtue of Bacon's Essays is one which is not frequently found in union with the scientific or philosophical intellect, viz., a poetical imagination. Bacon's similes for their aptness and their vividness are of the kind of which Shakespeare

or Goethe might have been proud." Again, Lord Lytton tells us "We have only to open the 'Advancement of Learning' to see how the Attic bees clustered above the cradle of the new philosophy. Poetry pervaded the thoughts, it inspired the similes, it hymned the majestic sentences of the wisest of mankind."

Then there is the testimony of Sir Tobie Matthew, the intimate friend who describes Bacon as "a man so rare in knowledge of so many several kinds, endued with the facility and felicity of expressing it all in so elegant, significant, so abundant, and yet so choice and ravishing a way of words, metaphors, and allusions as perhaps the world has never seen since it was a world."

But there is another side of Bacon's nature which is apt to be forgotten, for he was a curious mixture of the serious and the gay. There is a phrase of Ben Jonson's which might be appropriately applied to an occupant of the judicial bench at the present time. Bacon could seldom pass by a jest, we are told by Jonson; and in the midst of sage counsel and grave opinions we must not forget that Bacon was a prodigious wit. According to Macaulay, the best collection of jests in the world is that which Bacon dictated from memory, without referring to any book, on a day on which illness had rendered him incapable of any serious study. He delighted in masques and revels and pageantry of every kind. He was responsible for dramatic entertainments at Gray's Inn, at Whitehall, and Greenwich, and was one of the Treasurers of Gray's Inn, when they held their mimic court of the Prince of Purpoole and the first performance of the *Comedy of Errors*. He spent over £2,000 on the *Masque of Flowers*, and would not allow the members of Gray's Inn to contribute to the cost. When Sir Hy. Yelverton offered £500 he declined it and insisted on bearing all the expense himself.

Like Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Bacon might very well say of himself:—

"I am a fellow o' the strangest mind in the world, I delight in masques and revels sometimes altogether."

But perhaps something ought to be said about Bacon's conduct to the Earl of Essex; for ever since Macaulay wrote his inaccurate and malignant essay upon Bacon, biographers have taken the cue from Macaulay and have said harsh things about Bacon's disloyalty to his friend. It is a subject too great to deal with in detail on this occasion, but if there is anyone here

to-night who believes that Macaulay's condemnation of Bacon is just I would ask him to read Spedding's "Evenings with a Reviewer," and he will there find the solid foundation upon which Mr. Spedding, who had devoted forty years to the study of Bacon's life and works, bases his opinion that in the conduct of Bacon to Essex he can find nothing to blame.

In spite of the sneers of Pope and the wanton exuberances of Macaulay, we prefer to rest our appreciation of Bacon upon the testimony of his friends and contemporaries. Whatever failings Bacon had, it was the general opinion of his contemporaries that his virtues far outweighed his faults. I suppose nobody knew that great man so intimately as Sir Toby Matthew. When Matthew returned to England and was abandoned by his family and alienated from his friends, and imprisoned for his religion, at the instance of the Archbishop of Canterbury, we know that Bacon stood by him with unshaken fidelity, and it was on the intercession of Bacon that he was released from gaol and removed to Bacon's house. No wonder Matthew tells us

"He was a friend unalterable to his friends,
A man most sweet in his conversation and ways.
It was not his greatness I admire, but his virtue."

Ben Jonson says: "My conceit of his person was never increased by his place and honours; but I have and do reverence him for the greatness that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me ever by his work one of the greatest men and most worthy of admiration that had been in many ages. In his adversity I ever prayed God would give him strength, for greatness he could not want. Neither could I condole in a word or syllable for him, as knowing no accident could do harm to virtue but rather help to make it manifest."

It has been said that the measure of a man's worth is the worth of his aims. I don't think I exaggerate when I say that no one can read the "Advancement of Learning" or the "Novum Organum" without realising that the persistent aim and lifelong purpose of Bacon in all his contemplations and studies was the ultimate benefit of the human race. The publication of his philosophical writings involved a considerable outlay, from which he could expect no sort of remuneration. For he knew they appealed to a limited audience, and his avowed intention was merely to bring into correspondence minds already prepared and disposed for the

argument. It was certainly most true, as he states in his autobiography, that his heart was not set upon any of those things which depend upon external accidents. "I am not hunting for fame," he says, "I have no desire to found a sect, and to look for any private gain out of such an undertaking as this I count both ridiculous and contemptible. Enough for me the consciousness of well deserving and those real and effectual results with which fortune cannot interfere."

That was the spirit of the man whose memory we celebrate to-night, and I ask you to drink to "the immortal memory of Francis Bacon."

Mr. W. T. Smedley gave the toast of "The Bacon Society," which was responded to by the President. "The Guests," proposed by Mr. Crouch-Batchelor, was responded to by Mr. John Lomax. The health of the President, Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, was given by Mrs. Hinton Stewart. The souvenir and toast list contained a reproduction of the missing portrait of Bacon by Cornelius Janssen, referred to by James Spedding in the "History and Plan of this Edition," prefixed to Volume I. of his 1879 edition of the philosophical works of Francis Bacon. An account of the discovery of this portrait will be found in *BACONIANA*, Volume X., Series III., page 117.



TO FRANCIS BACON.

THE two years' effort, to read Night's great brow,
To count aright the wheeling, whirling stars,
This vast gigantic task is finished now,
And shows the truth of cloudy mists and bars.

Five hundred million stars we see—no less !
And each star is a swift revolving sun ;
And each is circled by its planets' press,
And each performs its billion centuries' run.

And an astronomer's observing eye
From these far spinning orbs could fathom yet
Myriads of others which still further lie,
Madly gyrating 'gainst the wall of jet.

Well—on these towering, huge, and mighty globes,
 Be there what mystic unknown life there may ;
 No being breathes who could wear wizard's robes
 As thou did'st in thy brief and brilliant day.

No, there hath lived no man in earth or sky
 Who could conceive a deep-laid scheme like thine,
 Carry it keenly through, and come to die
 Laughing but silent, making not a sign.

And we may take delight in this one thought—
 Our tiny trembling world, staggering, weak,
 In having unto birth and being brought
 The Greatest Trickster grandly is unique.

JULIA DITTO YOUNG.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Robertson's "Baconian Heresy."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—There is one characteristic of Mr. Robertson's book which ought not to be overlooked, and that is the title. In these days no theologian calls another heretic—it would be presumptuous to do so. The word is only used historically, and could only be applied to those who disbelieved what was at that time universally accepted, and when a standard of orthodoxy actually existed, viz., the doctrines approved by the Romish Church. So that anyone now applying the epithet to living persons constitutes himself an infallible judge of what is true and what is false, he is an amateur pope—an apostle holding a divine commission and authorized to speak in the name of God Himself. The same canon of orthodoxy has never existed in the literary world. Mr. Robertson is the first to crown himself with the quasi-apostolic mitre of literature, and in this his presumption is glaring and inexcusable.

A correspondent in Australia asks me if I have read this book, and remarks on its many omissions. The writer of the "Baconian Heresy" seems never to have heard, for instance, of Dr. William Thomson, who was one of the earliest champions of the Baconian alternative to the Shaxperian.

Mr. Robertson selects me as the Baconian most entitled to all the sarcasm, vituperation, and scorn that he can invent. My excellent friend, Mr. John Hutchinson, tells me that, with all its inaccuracies and sophistry, his selection of me is the greatest compliment he can pay me—as the most distinguished representative of the "Baconian heresy." If I can be smashed the case is complete, and all the rest may be ignored. Mr. Robertson com-

mits literary suicide as a controversialist when he "frankly announces that his purpose is not investigation but denunciation." A book of denunciation is *ipso facto* a crime.

The book is a monumental structure of impudence. This only could have led him to "denounce" as heretics such men as Judge Holmes, Judge Webb, Lord Penzance, Mr. Greenwood, Edwin Reed, Mark Twain, &c. His pose is that of infallibility: *I have spoken; let all others keep silence.*

R. M. THEOBALD.

The Great Instauration of Sciences.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—On pages 261-2 of H. Brett's translation of E. Bormann's "Shakespeare-Secret" (1895) is an argument that the Folio of 1623 was intended by Bacon to be the fourth, fifth and sixth parts of the "Instauratio Magna." Attention is also drawn to the fact that the third part was incomplete when Bacon died.

I have here a print representing Bacon seated, writing in a book labelled INSTAV MAGNA, the date of which is 1640. It may, perhaps, be the portrait in the Folio edition of the "De Augmentis Scientiarum," published in that year. By his side are two books labelled I. and II., and on a shelf stand four others labelled III., IV., V. and VI. The remarkable fact about these books is that they have their backs to the wall.

This appears to me to be a hint bearing out Bormann's contention, and I take leave to ask you to confirm the point, and to tell me if it has been made before.

W. E. L.

Shanghai, March 18, 1913.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Can any of your readers explain the meaning of the following lines from *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (IV. i.)?

Evans.—What is the focative case, William?

Will.—O,—Vocativo O.

Evans.—Remember, William, focative is *caret*.

The scene merely retards the action of the play, and is always omitted in representations. Dr. Johnson observed: "This is a very trifling scene, and no use to the plot, and I should think of no great delight to the audience." Steevens, however, says: "We may suppose this scene to have been a very entertaining one to the audience for which it was written." If the author's intention in introducing this scene was, by means of the Welshman's pronunciation, to give a clue to the authorship through the family joke (quoted in Bacon's "Apophthegms") of Hog not being Bacon until he be well hanged, it is probable that there are further ambiguities in these lines. No annotated edition appears

to offer any explanation of "focative is *caret*." It is certainly perplexing as to what is really meant. In the Folio the note of interrogation is printed inside the brackets with the name of William, thus :—

What is the focative case (William P).

This appears to give significance to "O,—Vocativo O," for O is nothing.

Yours truly, R. EAGLE.

4, Bampton Road, Forest Hill, S.E., June 6th, 1913.

Sundry Anagrams, &c.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Mr. Parker Woodward has failed to complete his most interesting longer article in the January number of 1913 through not showing the full meanings attaching to the title, "Willobie—His Avis," and to the supposed name-words—"Hadrian Dorrell."

These I find to be partly-alliterative anagrams built on startlingly-subtle antithetical phrases of true Shake-Speare Baconian quality. They are, respectively—Alibi, as Love, I wish; Her Lord and Liar.

The concordance is obvious of these two surrounding sentences with the Poem's central idea of "Chastity" in spiritual Vis "A Vis A" Vis.

Students of Metaphysics will observe in the mode of this further-suggested evolution of "Avisa" some resemblance to the principle of duplication in the Mystical "Religio Fons." By the way, these last two words occur on Folio I. of the Northumberland MSS., and are evidently from the pen of Francis Bacon as a self-revealed successor of the Illuminate of the Renaissance.

It would be too long a task here to show the possible psychological relationships imported by the words, "Chastity," "Love," "Lord," and "Liar."

To change the subject, Mr. Granville C. Cuninghame, in his letter on "Queen Elizabeth's Son," fails to recognize that the title of John Barclay's book—1621—"Argenis," is a perfect anagram of the word Reginas, acc. case, plural.

Prima facie, the word may relate to Mary, Queen of Scots, as well as to Elizabeth, Queen of England. The author of the "Fable" was born in France, and only spent a few years of his life in England. It is to be noted also that his father, who separated himself from the Scottish Court of Queen Mary, went to France with a grievance. The anagram solved ingeniously by Mr. B. H. Booth as "I spell Ham" has the validity of its rendering at once impaired by Mr. Cuninghame's own admission that the basal name was not at first spelt "Hiempsall."

Yours faithfully,

HENRY WOOLLEN.

12 West Ealing, February 24th, 1913.

"The Tempest" and "Adam Cupid."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In the last number of *BACONIANA*, Mr. R. L. Eagle and Dr. Theobald devoted three pages to studies of "Another Baconian Signature" and "Adam Cupid."

Mr. Eagle says:—"In the *Tempest* (Act I. Scene ii.) there is a similar instance, which appears to have gone unnoticed. It is where Prospero decides that the hour has come to tell Miranda what she is, and how they came upon the island:—

30.—For thou must now know further.

Mira. You have often
Begun to tell me what I am ; but stopped
And left me to a bootless inquisition.

43.—Concluding, *Stay, not yet.*

Prospero.— The hour's now come ;
The very minute bids thee ope thine ear ;
Obey, and be attentive."

"Here," says Mr. Eagle, "we have F. Bacon very clearly written, but in such a way that it is scarcely likely to be noticed by the reader." Why does Mr. Eagle not tell us what he means? Years ago in *Notes and Queries* I showed from this passage that the authorship of Bacon was maintained. It was in this wise:—

"No, not so much perdition as an hair,
Betid to any creature in the vessel
Which thou heard'st cry, which thou saw'st sink.
Sit down.
FOR thou must now know further.

Mira.— You have often
Begun to tell me what I am ; but stopp'd,
And left me to a bootless inquisition ;
CONcluding, 'Stay, not yet.'"

Well, what do we find here? Read down the initials of the lines:—N. B. W. S. for Bacon (or N. B. W. S., F. Bacon). In the first folio the words "Sit down" follow "sink," in the same line, so that if *sentences* commencing with capitals are taken in place of *lines*, the semi-acrostic still reads, "N. B., W. S. for you, Bacon." Something similar is found in *Love's Labour's Lost*, where we find the two consecutive lines:—

"BA moot seely sheepe, with a horne : you heare his learning,
[Quis quis] thou CONsonant."

Here we find, in this nonsensical dialogue, "Ba" commencing the first line and "con" beginning the last word of the next line—the conjunction forming "Ba-con."

Then in the cast of *The Tempest* we have a *Francisco*, a

perfectly useless character who speaks only a few words in the play. Following him is *Caliban*. The conjunction of the two characters is of some interest.

Francis/co
Cali/ban.

What is this but "Francis Bacon," without the "I cali"?

If there is any secret connected with the authorship of the Shakesperean dramas, it would certainly be revealed in *The Tempest*, the last of the plays. Curiously enough, at the end of the drama we have in the cast an "Anthonio, his brother," and a "Francisco." Anthony and Francis Bacon were brothers—the names are only "Italianized," Francis being known to his intimates as "Francisco." If we take the "Names of the Actors," it will be observed that if the letters forming the words "Francis Bacon" are taken and spell on the top of each word from "Alonso" at the beginning of the column to the word "Francisco" on the seventh line, the "n" of "Bacon" lands on the word "Francisco," the 36th word from the beginning, the spelling of "Francis Bacon" by letters being included *exactly three times*. Then let us start the count from the end of the column, and the "n" of "Bacon" also lands on the same word "Francisco," again the 36th word from the end, as it was from the beginning, "Francis Bacon" being once more included in the count *exactly three times*.

Is this accident? And the same occurs in all the plays where "Francisco" or "Francis" appears.

At the end of the cast we have :—

<i>Ariell, an ayrie spiris (sic).</i>	
<i>Iris</i>	
<i>Ceres</i>	
<i>Iuno</i>	
<i>Nymphes</i>	
Exit. <i>Reapers</i>	}
	<i>Spirits.</i>

FINIS.

What do we find here? Take all the initials and they read "I, Francis" or, adding the "Exit," "I, Francis. Exit."

The last word "Reapers" naturally suggests the anagram "Speare," and if we take "Nymphes," "Reapers," and "Exit"—the last three words of the play—an anagram might be formed :—

"Shaxpere, my pen tires,"

or,

My Shaxpere, I repent."

Next take the first three lines of *The Tempest* :—

Boat-swaine.

Heere Master : | What cheere ?

Good : | Speake to th' mariners.

Another anagram! "Heare, good Master. I, Bacon, wrote these. The name writ—Shakespeare." Good enough.

The last sentence, too, of *As You Like It* forms another very good anagram:—"As you like it of Francis Bacon, Lord Werulam. Do ye ne'er divulge me the wordes abroad, for this W. Shakespeare's fame is of me"! And this without adding or dropping a letter or leaving one over.

Some method in this madness!

In the same number of *BACONIANA*, on page 127, Dr. Theobald tries to explain the use of the term "Adam Cupid" in *Romeo and Juliet*, a term over which all the critics have been puzzled. We find in *Love's Labour's Lost* "Dan Cupid" (this also needs explanation). Dr. Theobald professes to find the key to this use of "Adam" in the Baconian statement that, like Adam, Cupid had "no parent of his own." But is it not more likely that "Adam" is a typographical error for "arméd"? In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* we have "Cupid all arméd." Certainly "arméd" applies admirably to Cupid, who is never seen in art without his bow and arrow. We find many similar typographical errors in the plays, many of them requiring long shots at sense from the commentators. For instance, take the opening lines of *Twelfth Night*, where "sweet sound" has been variously rendered as "sweet sough," "sweet south," &c., &c. Then we have all the guesses at "runaways eyes" in *Romeo and Juliet*, although I have seen it stated that in the days of Elizabeth a "runaway" was a night watchman, like Dogberry or Verges, which at once solves the difficulty.

Yours truly,

GEORGE STRONACH.

Edinburgh, 28th June, 1913.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I HAVE read with interest the correspondence which has been carried on in the columns of *The Academy*. A correspondent (Mr. Ferguson), in his letters to that journal of March and April, quotes Dr. Furnivall as describing Baconians as "folks who know nothing of either writer, or are cracked," and makes the same mistake in methods of defence that other "stand-patters" have made since the world began.

Why not look for the truth instead of defending an alleged truth? Why should not this, the most interesting literary problem ever propounded, be treated as a fair open question? The holding of one opinion or the other is not in itself evidence of superior wisdom or mental aberration.

Nothing is gained by Stratfordians in presenting Furnivall, of whom it is said that he found it more convenient to destroy a Baconian manuscript than to be confronted with the necessity of explaining it. Dr. Furnivall was a choleric, self-opinionated and ill-tempered man—the last person to quote on this subject. His methods were well illustrated by Dr. Appleton Morgan, author of

"The Shakesperean Myth" (1881), and Hon. Alvey A. Adeë (both university men) in *New Shakespereana*, a quarterly magazine published by the New York State Shakespeare Society at New York City, U.S.A., copies of which can be found in the Library of the Bacon Society and in the British Museum.

The correspondent "Tom Jones" (a writer who, while sniffing at the idea of Francis Bacon using pen-names, makes use of one himself), in his efforts to identify "Shake-scene" with Shakespeare, in Robert Greene's "Groat-worth of Wit" (1592), has proven nothing, but seems only to illustrate the desperate effort to obtain something tangible about "willm Shagsper" (1563—1616).

If "Shake-scene" is identical with Shakespeare, why not carry on the stupid conjecture and include, as identical with Shakespeare, "Shake-rags" in William Kempe's "Nine Day's Wonder" (1600), a pamphlet in the Bodleian Library. The quotation reads as follows :—

"My notable Shake-rags, the effect of my suit is discovered in the title of my application, but for your better understanding, for that I have known you to be a part of witless beetle-heads that can understand nothing but that is knocked into your scalp, so farewell and cross me no more with thy rabble of bold rhymes, lest at my return I set a crosse on thy forehead and that all men know that for a fool."

In a recent publication by William M. Chapman, of Santa Monica, California, U.S.A., entitled "William Shaksper and Robert Greene : The Evidence" (1912), is the most exhaustive analysis as yet presented on the identity of Greene's "Shake-scene" and Kempe's "Shake-rags." The most reasonable inference is that the former "Shake-scene" (equals Dance-scene) is no greater or lesser person than William Kempe himself, and not the Stratford actor.

CHAS. H. DEETZ.

Geodetic Survey, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Being engaged on a new publication on Bacon, intended for German Students, wherein the conclusive proofs of his authorship of the plays are taken from his own works, as published by Spedding, so far with eminent success, I am at a loss at the present juncture to trace the origin of a reference of his in Vol. XI., p. 137, which I beg herewith to submit to the readers of BACONIANA for elucidation.

There we read : "Myself am like the miller of Huntingdon that was wont to pray for peace among the willows ; for, while the wind blew, the windmills wrought, and the watermill was less customed. So I see the controversies of religion must hinder the advancement of science."

Whence is the story derived? Where the origin of it? So far as I am aware Bacon used it only once in the passage quoted. But what do we know else about this "miller of Huntingdon"?

Besides this, any innuendo or precise information concerning "*Toby Matthew*," that "alter ego" of Bacon's, would be most welcome. Does a recent publication exist containing satisfactory information? From what I find in Spedding, Toby Matthew appears to be the most important personage for Bacon-lore, besides Rawley and Ben. I even gather from this information the impression that this "rare friendship" may have left some traces in the Sonnets.

There are some most interesting hints or suggestions given about Toby Matthew in *BACONIANA* (1903, 1905, 1908, 1910, 1912). Even a publication about him is announced as forthcoming (1903), and another book about Matthew's "conversion" is recommended, 1905. But does this book give *all the rest* of what we ought to know about the "Alter Ego"? A monograph or special treatise available concerning all the data or information known about "Good Mr. Matthew," and any information about the "miller of Huntingdon," would be most welcome to

Your obedient servant, G. HOLZER.

Heidelberg.

TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

SIR,—I desire to draw the attention of readers of *BACONIANA* to a proposal to establish a Correspondence Circle. Discussion in a publication which only appears quarterly is difficult. A few Baconians interested in tracing the cipher and other disclosures in the books of Francis Bacon and of his secret fraternity for the advancement of learning and arts, and the maintenance of the Established Church and its Protestant tenets, propose to start a Correspondence Circle.

They will print a column of notes and queries on these special subjects and circulate it amongst those who join the Circle, for addition, reply, or adverse comment. Each member will thus be able to judge how far any subject has approached solution or may be dismissed as wanting in proof or probability.

Resulting papers could be offered for publication, if desired, in *BACONIANA*, or any other public print willing to give them publicity.

The Circle would be confined to those willing to contribute.

Any valuable "finds" resulting from this co-operative research would belong to those who had contributed to the successful result, the proportion to be settled by arbitration in case of difference.

Names of those willing to join the Circle may be forwarded to me as Secretary *pro tem*.

PARKER WOODWARD.

York House King Street, Nottingham.

NOTES.

MR. DANIEL FORD, of the University of Minnesota, sent the following interesting information to the *New York Post* :—

“In Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*, in a speech by Hector, occur the following lines (II. ii. 165—7) :

“ ‘Not much
Unlike young men, whom Aristotle thought
Unfit to hear moral philosophy.’

“For some time (*vide* Holmes’s ‘The Authorship of Shakespeare’ *et al.*) Baconians have pointed to these lines as evidential of Bacon’s authorship of the plays. They call attention to the fact that in Bacon’s ‘Advancement of Learning’ (first printed in 1605) Aristotle, as in *Troilus and Cressida* (first printed in 1609), was misquoted, and in a similar manner Bacon says, ‘Is not the opinion of Aristotle . . . to be regarded wherein he saith that young men are no fit auditors of moral philosophy?’ (Aristotle had said that young men are unfit to *study Political Philosophy*.—‘Nichomachean Ethics, I. 8.) But the misquotation goes back to a date some eighty years earlier than 1605. Erasmus, in his ‘Colloquia Familiara,’ in his address to the reader, entitled ‘De Utilitate Colloquiorum’ (Basil, 1526) says, ‘Velut irrepens in animos adolescentium quos recte scripsit Aristoteles inidoneos auditores Ethicæ Philosophiæ.’ And again a few lines further on he says: ‘Aristotelis Ethice non est apta pueris.’ In regard, then, to the lines in *Troilus and Cressida*, Erasmus, not Bacon, was responsible for the misrepresentation of what Aristotle wrote. (*Troilus and Cressida*, though not published till 1609, was certainly acted much earlier, *vide* Malone, Furnivall, Halliwell, *et al.*)”

In *La Grand Revue* for June is an article by M. Maurice Castellan, Professor à la Faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. The article consists of an elaborate review of “The Man Shakespeare and His Tragic Life-story,” by Mr. Frank Harris, which was published in 1909. Professor Castellan in his introduction refers to the Bacon theory. English criticism, he says, has never taken very

seriously to the arguments of the Baconians, and in this it has been wrong, for there are some very curious ones. But their theory only being an hypothesis until further discoveries have been made, the actor Shakspeare must be considered as the author of the plays. The professor is making an investigation of the subject. He has read some eight or ten books on the question, and although hitherto not converted to the thesis, he confesses that some of the arguments are most curious and impressive. Considerable attention is now being directed in France to the subject. If the controversy catches on there will be a prospect of the arguments being impartially considered. Frenchmen little dream how great is their interest in the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays, and how closely these are associated with the great literary movement in their country of the period.

The Society of Warwickshire Folk in London have annually a literary evening. This year it was devoted to a debate on "Who Wrote the Shakespeare Plays?" The proceedings took place on Friday, the 23rd of May. The chair was occupied by Mr. R. A. Peddie. The debate was opened on the Baconian side by Mr. H. Crouch Batchelor, who was supported by Mr. Harold Hardy, Mr. W. T. Smedley, and Mr. R. L. Eagle. The Shakespearean side was advocated by Mr. William Jaggard (of Stratford-on-Avon), Mr. E. M. Pollock, M.P., K.C., Mr. Reginald R. Buckley, Mr. W. H. Edwards, and Mrs. C. C. Stopes. The audience were not invited to express an opinion, but the services of eight gentlemen were obtained who acted as judges. To them, at the close of the debate, the following question was submitted:—Which party has succeeded in establishing the best *prima facie* case this evening? The result was that five of the judges gave their vote in favour of the Shakspearean side, two in favour of the Baconian side, and one considered that although the *prima facie* case was in favour of Shakspeare, the Baconians had the best of the arguments. There was a large audience. The proceedings were of a very interesting character, and the literary evening proved a great success.